

**EMT-1 REGULATORY TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES
December 5, 2001
Regional Public Safety Training Institute
San Diego, CA**

I. Introductions

A. Self-introductions were made.

MEMBERS PRESENT	EMSA STAFF PRESENT	ALTERNATES PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	ALTERNATES ABSENT
Ray Casillas	Sean Trask	Bruce Kenagy	Nancy Casazza	David Nevins
Bob Cordray	Richard Watson		Elaine Dethlefsen	Debbie Notturmo
Donna Ferracone	Nancy Steiner		Tom McGinnis	Jeff Page
Bruce Haynes			Byron Parsons	Jean English
Pat Kramm			Marco Randazzo	
Debbie Meier			Bob Repar	
Debi Moffat				
Dan Paxton				
Karen Petrilla				
John Pritting				
Veronica				
Shepardson				
Susan Smith				
John Tysell				
Luann Underwood				
Kevin White				
Todd Wilhoyte				

II. Minutes

Approved as written

III. Agenda

Approved as written.

IV. Informational Update

A. The Task Force was updated on the following items

1. The proposed Layperson AED regulations were presented to the EMS Commission at the November 28, 2001 EMS Commission meeting with revisions resulting from the 45-day public comment period that ended on October 29, 2001. The proposed regulations were going to go out for a 15-day public comment period with the recommendation that the EMS Commission approve the draft regulations absent any changes from the 15-day comment period. After a lot of discussion, the EMS Commission asked EMSAAC to put together an advisory group and submit a recommendation to the EMS Authority within 90-days. The EMS Authority is waiting EMSAAC's recommendation due in February.
2. The EMS Commission also discussed the topic of a single standardized exam that is being discussed at the EMT-I Task Force. Some of the points of discussion were: a concern about dropping the recertification testing requirement, especially for those EMTs that do not work in traditional EMT-I positions (theme parks, industrial settings); with respect to the National Registry, the issue of cost, turn-around times for test results, customer service and testing processes were raised. The EMS Commission suggested that the EMS Authority make a presentation at a future Commission meeting.

3. Sean reported that he has polled a number of states that use the NR EMT-I exam to see if they had entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU). Sean was unable to find a state that had an MOU. Sean also checked with San Diego County EMS Agency and they are looking for their MOU, but have not provided the EMS Authority with a copy yet. The paramedic-licensing unit of the EMS Authority does not have a MOU with the NR.
4. EMT-II Regulations - The Emergency Medical Services Medical Directors Association of California (EMDAC) reviewed the draft regulations and made a few comments, the biggest comment was to delete endotracheal intubation for adults and pediatric patients. The Combitube would be the advanced airway for the EMT-IIs. The changes will be made and distributed possibly in February or sooner.
5. The Task Force reviewed the voting rules that were agreed upon at a previous meeting. Those rules are: one vote per constituent group, if the primary and alternate representatives are both present, the primary representative can make motions and vote, but not both members, the EMS Authority does not have a vote, and a simple majority carries the motion.

V. Old Business

A. EMT-I Certification Examination:

Discussion continued in regards to the National Registry EMT-I Exam.

1. Before the topic was opened for discussion, and possible motions and voting, Sean asked the Task Force to consider multiple options such as more than one exam. The Task Force responded that in order to accomplish this suggestion, the Task Force's Objective #2 would have to be changed since, Objective #2 specifies a single exam. A motion was made and seconded to support Objective #2 as it is written. The votes are as follows:

Ayes

Southern California Fire Chiefs
Northern California Fire Chiefs
California Professional Firefighters
EMS Commission Technical Advisory
Group
CSFA
CHP
CA Paramedic Program Directors – North
Service Employees International Union
Emergency Nurses Association
EMSAAC
Public Member
CA Paramedic Program Directors - South
CA Association of HMOs
CA Council of EMS Educators
EMDAC

Nos

State Fire Marshal

The Task Force members present voted 15 in favor of Objective #2, and one opposed to Objective #2. The motion passed and there is no change to Objective #2.

2. Kevin White made a motion that the EMT-I Task Force considered the National Registry exam per Objective #2, but reject the National Registry exam and requires no more consideration of the National Registry. The motion was seconded by LuAnne Underwood. There was a lengthy discussion followed by a friendly amendment that was made which changed the motion to, Per Objective #2, we have considered the National Registry, we reject the National Registry and requires no more consideration by this Task Force. The results of the vote were:

Ayes	Nos
Southern California Fire Chiefs	Service Employees International Union
Northern California Fire Chiefs	Emergency Nurses Association
State Fire Marshal	EMSAAC
California Professional Firefighters	Public Member
EMS Commission Technical Advisory Group	CA Paramedic Program Directors - South
CSFA	CA Association of HMOs
CHP	CA Council of EMS Educators
CA Paramedic Program Directors – North	EMDAC

The vote was tie, 8 yes, 8 nos, the motion failed.

3. Dr. Tysell made a motion that the State of California adopts the National Registry as the EMT-I Certifying exam. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion.

Ayes	Nos
Service Employees International Union	Southern California Fire Chiefs
Emergency Nurses Association	Northern California Fire Chiefs
EMSAAC	State Fire Marshal
Public Member	California Professional Firefighters
CA Paramedic Program Directors - South	EMS Commission Technical Advisory Group
CA Association of HMOs	CSFA
CA Council of EMS Educators	CHP
EMDAC	CA Paramedic Program Directors – North

The vote was tie, 8 yes, 8 nos, the motion failed.

4. After the vote, members of the Task Force mentioned that not all options have been explored, for example an existing certification exam within California, such as a local EMS agency or a statewide public safety agency had not presented an exam for consideration. The Task Force was reminded that the members of the Task Force were offered the opportunity for an existing certification exam to be presented but there were no responses. Other issues that were raised were that a problem statement was not developed which defines the problem that the Task Force is attempting to solve by recommending a single standardized certification exam. Another issue that was raised was that the logistics of implementing a single standardized exam throughout California were not addressed.
5. Since the Task Force reached an impasse in regards to the National Registry, but not a single standardized EMT-I certification exam, Richard Watson, Interim Director, wishes to see all avenues explored and suggested that the Task Force move forward with the idea of a MOU which contains items that the Task Force can agree to. The next step will be to send out a request for information to interested parties that develop examinations and include all certifying authorities in California including local EMS agencies, the CHP, the State Fire Marshal, and local public safety agencies. The Task Force would then review presentations from these parties. This way the Task Force will have evaluated all options.
6. The Task Force then established a list of minimum requirements for the interested organizations to address, those items are:
 - a. The exam must follow the DOT National Standard Curriculum.
 - b. There must be an explanation of the validation process.

- c. There must be an explanation of how the exam is developed and address the item writing process including the qualifications and background of item writers.
 - d. There must be an explanation of the on-going maintenance and periodic revisions.
 - e. There must be an explanation of the timeline of when the exam would be available.
 - f. There must be an explanation of the administration process to address: who can give the exam, lead-time for scheduling the exam.
 - g. There must be an explanation of the security of the exam.
 - h. There must be an explanation of how the exam is supported legally if challenged in court.
 - i. There must be a per-student cost or individual test cost.
 - j. There must be an explanation of the organizations customer service.
 - k. There must be an explanation of how the testing organization can administer a skills exam.
 - l. There must be an explanation of the turn-around time for test results.
 - m. The candidates should also be prepared to address additional items that may come up.
7. Sean Trask will type the letter and send it out to all certifying authorities in California as well as other testing organizations such as the National Registry, Cooperative Personnel Services, Brady, Mosby, Prometrics to solicit their interest. The interested parties should submit a letter of interest by February 1, 2002 and be prepared to make presentations on April 9, 2002. This letter of interest shall specify that the Task Force is only interested in making a recommendation and not awarding a contract. Interested parties may or may not have a test and testing process developed.
8. The Task Force then discussed the problems of why we are discussing standardizing processes such as the certification exam. Some of those reasons are:
- a. A standardized expanded scope of practice
 - b. Inconsistencies within and between local EMS agencies including but not limited to training and certification.
 - c. Differences in costs
 - d. DOT curriculum with enhancements
 - e. Certification testing and retesting – some agencies allow EMT candidates to test as many times as necessary, some that use the NR exam allow six attempts before the candidate has to retake the basic EMT course.
 - f. Differences in the validity of the certification exam
 - g. Differences in the security of the exam.
9. The Task Force members agreed to form a sub-committee, called the MOU Sub-Committee to further define the items that will be addressed in the presentations from the interested testing organizations. The sub-committee will also review interested testing organization's intent to make a presentation. The MOU Sub-Committee agreed to have their work completed by February 1, 2002. The members are:
- a. Veronica Shepardson
 - b. Ray Casillas
 - c. LuAnne Underwood
 - d. Donna Ferracone
 - e. Karen Petrilla or Elaine Dethlefson
 - f. Todd Wilhoyte

Proposals from interested parties should be received by mid March for review by this sub-committee.

- B. Committee Report: EMT Approving Authority
 - 1. Section 100066 - For clarification, the Task Force members agreed that EMT-I training program approval is only for an entire basic EMT-I course. There are no separate approvals for refresher courses. If a training program offers only refresher courses, that training program needs to have a full basic course approval.
 - 2. Section 100066 – For clarification the Task Force agreed that EMT-I training program approval does not occur until the verification committee has completed their site visit.
 - 3. Section 100066(b)(9) includes continuing education courses in the same sub-section as refresher courses, which is under the section regarding Procedure for Program Approval. The question to the Task Force was if continuing education courses should be removed from this section and placed in a continuing education section so that the two different types of training do not get intermingled. These two types of training require separate and distinct approvals and approval processes. After much discussion, the Task Force wants to study this issue further and table the topic for a later date. The Task Force was reminded that the Paramedic Task Force is addressing the issue of continuing education and that the EMT-I Task Force should consider their recommendations to make the EMT-I and paramedic continuing education requirements consistent.
 - 4. Section 100066, sub-sections (b)(2, 3 & 12) – Moved to sub-section (c) in the same section.
 - 5. Section 100070, Sub-section (a) The Task Force agreed to eliminate the proof of instruction methodology class for the medical director. The Task Force will also check to see if experience in emergency medicine qualifies as the experience in prehospital care.
 - 6. Section 100070, Sub-sections (b & c) - The Task Force needs to check to see if the Program and the Course Director are the same or if they are separate roles.
 - 7. Section 100070, sub-sections (d & e) - The Task Force discussed clarified whether or not an EMT-I could be the primary instructor, since this is different from current regulations.
 - 8. The Task Force still needs to address Sections 100071-100078 and the EMT-I scope of practice.

VI. New Business

- A. Review of Task Force Objectives
 - 1. The Task Force Objectives were reviewed.

VII. Discussion:

- A. Review of Action Items
 - 1. Sean will draft a letter of interest soliciting potential certification exam organizations.
 - 2. The Task Force has agreed to open up discussions of the EMT-I scope of practice at the next Task Force meeting.

Next meeting will be January 9, 2002 from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM, in Sacramento.

Recorder: Karen Petrilla